DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 251 TM 027 183

AUTHOR Straus, Murray A.; Hamby, Sherry L.; Finkelhor, Daniv; Moore, David; Runyan, Desmond

TITLE Identification of Child Maltreatment with the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales: Development & Psychometric Data for a National Sample of American Parents.

SPONS AGENCY New Hampshire Univ., Durham.; National Inst. of Mental Health (DHHS), Bethesda, MD.

PUB DATE 1997-03-00

NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).

CONTRACT T32MH15161

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Aggression; *Child Abuse; Conflict; Data Collection; Emotional Abuse; *Identification; *Incidence; *Parent Child Relationship; Parents; Psychometrics; Test Construction; Test Reliability; *Test Use; Test Validity; Violence

IDENTIFIERS *Conflict Tactics Scale

ABSTRACT

The Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales (CTSPC), a version of the well-established Conflict Tactics Scales, was developed to improve its ability to obtain data on physical and psychological child maltreatment. The conceptual and methodological approaches used to develop the CTSPC are described and psychometric data, including reliability, validity, and normative data, are presented based on a nationally representative sample of 1,000 U.S. parents. The Psychological Aggression and Physical Assault scales of the original version were revised to: (1) improve clarity and age-appropriateness; (2) add items to increase content validity; and (3) better differentiate among levels of severity of aggression by parents. A supplementary scale has been added to address child neglect. Reliability ranges from 0 for the severe physical assault subscale to 0.70 for the nonviolent discipline subscale. Despite low reliability coefficients, the CTSPC has found a prevalence rate for physical maltreatment of 49 per 1,000, much greater than for cases reported to child protective services, and 5 times greater than the rate uncovered in a national incidence study. The CTSPV is better suited to measure child maltreatment than the original instrument. It is brief and easy to administer. The instrument is attached as an appendix. (Contains 2 tables and 50 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 251

Identification of Child Maltreatment with the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scale: Development & Psychometric Data for a National Sample of American Parents

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Murray A. Straus
Sherry L. Hamby
David Finkelhor
David Moore
Desmond Runyan

TM027183

This paper is prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Chicago, IL

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IDENTIFICATION OF CHILD MALTREATMENT WITH THE THE PARENT-CHILD CONFLICT TACTICS SCALES: DEVELOPMENT AND PSYCHOMETRIC DATA FOR A NATIONAL SAMPLE OF AMERICAN PARENTS *

Murray A. Straus, Sherry L. Hamby, David Finkelhor
Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire
Durham, NH 03824 (603) 862-2594, MAS2@CHRISTA.UNH.EDU
David W. Moore
The Gallup Organization, Princeton, NJ 08542
Desmond Runyan
Department of Social Medicine, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599

Abstract

Objective: Although the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) have been used to obtain data for over 100 studies of physical and psychological child maltreatment, it has a number of limitations. The research was designed to create a version of the CTS, the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales (CTSPC), that address some of these limitations.
Method: The conceptual and methodological approaches used to develop the CTSPC are described. Psychometric data are presented based on a nationally representative sample of 1,000 U.S. parents, including reliability, validity, and normative data on prevalence and chronicity.
Results: The Psychological Aggression and Physical Assault scales have been revised to (1) improve clarity and age-appropriateness; (2) add items to increase content validity; (3) better differentiate between levels of severity of aggression by parents. There is also a new supplementary scale to measure Neglect, and supplemental questions on discipline methods in the previous week, and on sexual abuse. The reliability of the CTSPC scales ranges from zero for the severe physical assault subscale of the Physical Assault scale, to .70 for the Non-violent Discipline scale. Despite low reliability coefficients, the CTSPC found a prevalence rate for physical maltreatment of 49 per thousand, which is eleven times greater than for cases reported to child protective services in 1994 and five times greater than the rate uncovered by the third National Incidence Study. Data indicating discriminant and construct validity are presented.
Conclusions: The CTSPC is better suited to measuring child maltreatment than the original CTS. It is brief (6 to 8 minutes for the core scales) and therefore practical for epidemiological research on child maltreatment and as a screening device in clinical settings Despite the improvements, some of the problems remain. These are discussed in an analysis of methodological issues inherent in parent self-report measures of child maltreatment.

TM027183

It is a pleasure to express appreciation to the Gallup Organization for the survey to obtain the data reported in this paper. This paper is a publication of the Measurement Research Program of the Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824. A list of publications on measurement will be sent on request to Straus. The research has been funded by National Institute of Mental Health grant T32MH15161 and the University of New Hampshire.

Table Of Contents

PREVIOUS USES OF THE CTS TO MEASURE CHILD MALTREATMENT 4

COMPARISON OF CTS1 AND CTSPC 5

Theoretical Basis And Mode Of Operationalization 5
Theoretical basis 5
Measures Parent Behavior Rather Than Injury Or Other Outcomes 5
Augmented Scales 5
Supplemental Scales And Questions 5
Improved Items 5
Interspersed Order of Items 5

SCALE NAMES, DEFINITIONS, AND LENGTH 6
Nonviolent discipline 6
Psychological aggression 6
Physical assault 6
Supplemental questions on discipline in the previous week 6
Neglect 7
Sexual abuse 7

THE GALLUP SURVEY 7
Sample 7
Sample Characteristics 7

PREVALENCE AND CHRONICITY 8
Definitions 8
Prevalence 8
Chronicity 8
Rates 8

RELIABILITY 9

DISCRIMINANT AND CONSTRUCT VALIDITY 9
Demographic Correlates 9
Age of parent 9
Age of child 10
Minority race/Ethnic group 10
Gender of parent 10
Correlations Among CTSPC Scales 10
Correlates of nonviolent discipline 11
Correlates of corporal punishment 11
Correlates of physical abuse 11

DISCUSSION 12
Issues and Difficulties in the Measurement of Child Abuse 12
Developmental issues 12
Normative issues and social desirability 12
Reliability 13
Possible Uses of the CTSPC 13
Epidemiological research on prevalence 14
Clinical screening 14
Evaluation of treatment and prevention programs 14

APPENDIX 1. ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING 14
Applicable Populations 14
Educational and Ethnic group 14
Child respondents 14
Self Only and Self and Partner Mode of Administration 14
Other uses 15
Length and Testing Time 15
Referent Time Period and Referent Situation 15
Referent time period 15
Referent event or situation 15
Permission for Research Use of the CTSPC 16
Scoring 16
Treatment of response category 7 16
Prevalence and chronicity 16
Alternative Response Categories 16

APPENDIX 2. PARENT-CHILD CONFLICT TACTICS SCALES, FORM A 17
ITEMS IN INTERSPERSED ORDER 17

ITEMS ARRANGED BY SCALE AND SUBSCALE 18
Non-violent Discipline 18
Psychological Aggression 18
Physical Assault 18
Minor Assault (Corporal Punishment 18
Severe Assault (Physical Abuse) 18
Very Severe Assault (Severe Physical Abuse) 18
SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS 19
Weekly Discipline 19
Neglect 19
Sexual Abuse 20

REFERENCES 21

TABLES 24

Most research on physical and psychological maltreatment of children, and virtually all research on neglect, is based on cases obtained from treatment or judicial agencies. Despite the importance of these clinically based studies, only a small fraction of maltreatment cases are known to social or judicial agencies. Moreover, there is evidence from studies of alcoholism and other social and psychological problems that cases in the general population suffering from the same problem may differ from "clinical" cases in ways that affect treatment or prevention programs (Straus, 1990b). Consequently, epidemiological research on child maltreatment in the general population is needed in addition to clinically based studies.

One of the requirements for epidemiological survey research on the general population is a practical method of ascertaining the presence and degree of maltreatment. The Conflict Tactics Scales or CTS (Straus, 1979, 1990a; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) was designed to meet that need. This paper describes a new version of the CTS called the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales (CTSPC). The CTSPC is intended to measure psychological and physical maltreatment and neglect of children by parents, as well as non-violent modes of discipline.

PREVIOUS USES OF THE CTS TO MEASURE CHILD MALTREATMENT

The original CTS (to be called CTS1 from here on) has important limitations as a measure of child maltreatment (discussed in Straus & Hamby, 1997). The limitations stem from the fact that the CTS1 was designed for use with partners in a marital, cohabiting or dating relationship. To adapt it for measuring parental behavior, the main modification was to change the referent person from "your partner" to a specific child. Although the CTS1 has worked remarkably well as a measure of child maltreatment (see the review in Straus & Hamby, 1997), some items were not really appropriate for parent-child relationships, and some important parental behaviors were not included.

A search of the literature from 1980 through 1994 revealed over 400 publications reporting findings from data obtained with the CTS1 (see bibliography in Straus, 1995). Most report data on couples. However, 93 used the CTS1 to measure violence toward children. Of these, 52 were based on data from responses to the CTS1 by parents, 10 were papers based on administration of the CTS1 to children, and 30 were papers that used the CTS1 to obtain recall data from adults about the behavior of their parents. More important than frequency of use is the evidence accumulating from these studies of the concurrent and construct validity of the CTS1 as a measure of maltreatment of children (summarized in Straus & Hamby, 1997).

An elementary but critically important indicator of validity is the fact that the rate of severe physical assault found by nine different investigators (summarized in Straus & Gelles, 1990b, Table 6-3, part B) shows that the CTS identifies many more cases than are known to child protective services (CPS), which is consistent with the long standing belief of CPS workers that there are many times more cases than are referred to them. A type of concurrent validity is the level of agreement between different members of the same family, such as the extent to which the report of a parent agrees with that of a child. Straus & Hamby (1997) summarize the results of six such studies, each of which found substantial agreement. The most extensive evidence is on construct validity. Almost all of the 93 studies located in our search provide evidence of construct validity because they report findings that are consistent with previously established empirical findings, such as the links between stress and physical abuse found by Eblen (1987) and Straus & Kaufman Kantor (1987), or consistent with "strong" theories such as studies that are consistent with social learning theory in showing than parents who were seriously assaulted as children are more likely that other parents to seriously assault their own children (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Gelles & Straus, 1988).

The extent to which the CTS1 has been used in research on child maltreatment, despite its limitations, suggests that the revision described in this paper could make the CTSPC an even more useful instrument that the CTS1.

COMPARISON OF CTS1 AND CTSPC

Theoretical Basis And Mode Of Operationalization

Theoretical basis. Despite the important differences between the CTS1 and the CTSPC, the theoretical basis and mode of operationalization are fundamentally the same. The theoretical basis of the CTS is conflict theory (Adams, 1965; Coser, 1956; Dahrendorf, 1959; Scanzoni, 1972; Simmel, 1955; Sprey, 1979; Straus, 1979). This theory assumes that conflict is an inevitable part of all human association, whereas physical assault as a tactic to deal with conflict is not (Coser, 1956; Dahrendorf, 1959). The CTSPC therefore measures both physical assaults and other tactics.

Measures Parent Behavior Rather Than Injury Or Other Outcomes. The CTSPC measures the extent to which a parent has carried out specific acts of physical and psychological aggression, regardless of whether the child was injured. Because the CTSPC measures parental behavior rather than injury, and to avoid confusion with use of the term "abuse" to indicate an injured child, the CTS scales are identified as measures of maltreatment. The reasons for measuring acts of maltreatment separately from presumed causes (such as attitudes about violence) and effects (such as physical or psychological injury) are discussed in detail elsewhere (Straus, 1990a,b; Straus & Hamby, 1997). One of the most important benefits of mesuring maltreatment seperately is that it permits investigatigating the antecedents and effects of maltreatment.

Augmented Scales

A recurring dilemma in test construction is the balance between a test which is brief enough to be applicable in situations that permit only limited testing time (Nelson & Berwick, 1989) and long enough to achieve an adequate sampling of the universe of content (content validity) and enough observations, i.e., enough items, to achieve an adequate level of reliability. CTS1 may have erred on the side of brevity. The CTSPC therefore, has additional items in each of the three original scales.

Supplemental Scales And Questions

The CTSPC includes a supplemental scale on Neglect and supplemental questions on corporal punishment and sexual abuse. We identify the weekly corporal punishment items as supplemental because the purpose is to add more detail based on a shorter referent period. We identify the sexual abuse items and the Neglect scale as supplemental because, although they are important forms of child maltreatment, conceptually, neither is a conflict tactic.

Improved Items

The wording of all items was reviewed and the wording was changed as needed to improve clarity and appropriateness as an indicator of parental behavior. For example, the item "Threw something at him/her" did not indicate whether this was a pillow or a brick. The CTSPC version of the item makes it explicit by specifying "Threw something that could hurt." Some items were deleted and some new items were added. The severe assault part of the Physical Assault scale has been strengthened by the addition of two new items. The distinction between minor and severe has been applied to the Psychological Aggression scale. As result, we believe the CTSPC provides a better operationalization of the distinction between minor and severe acts.

Interspersed Order of Items

The CTS1 presented the items in hierarchical order of social acceptability, starting with the socially desirable items in the Reasoning scale such as "Discussed an issue calmly" and ending with the most severe of the Physical Assault items (used a knife or gun). For the

CTSPC, however, the items from different scales and different levels of severity are interspersed in a randomly determined order. There were several reasons for choosing the interspersed order. One is that despite the plausibility of providing a context of legitimation, some users of the CTS have asked only the physical violence questions, yet gotten results that are meaningful. In addition we believed that an interspersed order makes it more difficult to blindly respond "Never" to all items, and that an interspersed order may also minimize "demand characteristics" by making less obvious which items are scored on each subscale, and by requiring participants to think about each item more than would be the case if they were in groups of similar items. Finally, the pre-test for the national survey that provided the data for this article encountered some non-violent parents who objected to the hierarchical order. Having declared that they never did the first of the violent acts and "would never do anything like that," they were a little irritated to be asked about eleven other violent acts. This did not occur with the interspersed order. A definitive answer to the question of which order (hierarchical or interspersed) is best will depend on an experiment in which random halves of the respondents are given the hierarchical and interspersed item version. In the meantime, we recommend using the interspersed order of items, as given in the appendix.

SCALE NAMES, DEFINITIONS, AND LENGTH

Nonviolent discipline. The Nonviolent discipline scale measures use of four disciplinary practices that are widely used alternatives to corporal punishment (explanation, time out, deprivation of privilege, and substitute activity). This scale replaces the CTS1 Reasoning scale. The replacement does not involve an important loss of continuity with the CTS1 because the original Reasoning scale was inadequate in both the number and content of the items and was rarely used.

Psychological aggression. This scale is intended to measure verbal and symbolic acts by the parent that cause psychological pain or fear on the part of the child. See Vissing, Straus, Gelles, & Harrop (1991) for a conceptual analysis and empirical data on the CTS1 version of this scale. The CTS1 version had 6 items and included acts such as "sulked or refused to talk" that may not be particularly salient as behaviors that parents exhibit towards children. The CTSPC version has 5 items, of which two are modified from the CTS1 child form and three are new. One important modification is that "Threatened to hit or throw something at him/her" has been rewritten to include spanking and to specify that the threat was not actually carried out.

Physical assault. The name of the Violence scale was changed to Physical Assault because all the items refer to acts that are covered by state laws on physical assault. The CTS1 included 9 physical assault items. The CTSPC has 13. Eight are modifications of CTS1 items to make them more appropriate for parent-child interactions, and four are new. The items cover a wide range of severity and legality. At the low severity end, spanking and other forms or corporal punishment are acts that have traditionally been expected responses of parents to persistent misbehavior (Straus, 1994; Straus & Mathur, 1996). Scores at the high severity end of the scale (such as punching or kicking a child) are indicators of physical abuse. The items in this scale can be used to compute subscales for minor and severe Corporal Punishment (acts of minor physical assault for which parents are granted an exemption from prosecution for assault),Severe Assault (Physical Abuse), and Very Severe Assault (Severe Physical Abuse).

Supplemental questions on discipline in the previous week. These questions were added because they refer to parental behaviors that are often so frequent that the usual CTSPC referent period of the previous 12 months is not meaningful. For example, Giles-Sims, Straus, and Sugarman (1995) found that at least two thirds of American mothers reported having spanked their child in the past week. Moreover, they spanked, on average, more than three times that week. It is unrealistic to expect such parents to do the mental calculations needed to estimate how often they had spanked in the last year. Consequently, rates based on a one year, or even a six month, referent period are almost certain to drastically underestimate the use of corporal punishment.

BEST COPY AVA...

Neglect. The Neglect scale is intended to measure failure to engage in behavior that is necessary to meet the developmental needs of a child, such as not providing adequate food or supervision. (See Straus, Williams, & Kinard for a conceptual analysis and a multidimensional neglect scale.) As in the case of physical and psychological maltreatment, neglect is scored for failing to meet these needs regardless of whether the child is actually damaged by the neglect.

Sexual abuse. On an experimental basis, we developed four questions to inquire about the child's experience of sexual assault. Most questionnaires about sexual abuse have been designed to ask adults retrospectively about their childhoods. Many have assumed that parents would be either unlikely to know about or reluctant to disclose abuse occurring to their own children. But as public discussions of abuse have become more open and more abuse is being disclosed, it may be possible to elicit reports about contemporaneous sexual abuse to children from parents. We decided to ask two questions about sexual abuse, one about unwanted sexual touch and another about forced sexual contact. To clarify that we were interested in acts perpetrated by both adults and children and family members as well as those outside the family, we included mention of all these possibilities in the question. The Gallup Survey used two of these questions. A theoretical explication and the findings from these two questions is in Finkelhor, Moore, Hamby, & Straus (1997).

THE GALLUP SURVEY

The CTSPC was used (with minor modifications to be noted below) in a study of a nationally representative sample of American parents conducted by the Gallup Organization in the summer of 1995 (Gallup survey, #765). The questions were pretested on a sample of 14 cases, and the wording of some items was revised to correct problems that were uncovered.

Sample

The survey was conducted by telephone in August and September, 1995. Random digit dialing was used to contact and screen for households with children under the age of 18. One thousand such households were identified from a screening of 2250 adults. The refusal rate among eligible adults was 19%, and the overall response rate was 52%, which takes into account numbers that were busy or never answered. (More than 90% of the unresolved numbers were called six times.) In two parent households, one parent was randomly selected for the interview. All survey questions pertained to one particular child, who in multi-child households was also chosen by a random selection process.

Sample Characteristics

The data on the children in the survey matched U.S. 1990 Census information fairly closely for characteristics of children under 18 such as gender (49% girls), and minority representation (12% Black, 7% Hispanic). The mean age of parents was 36.8 years. More mothers than fathers were interviewed (66% of the sample), partly because the sample included single parents who are predominantly mothers. Fifty two percent of the parents were married, 15% remarried, 20% divorced, 8% never married, and 4% were cohabiting. The referent children ranged in age from infants to age 17, with a mean age of 8.4 years. There was an over representation of households with parents holding a college education (34% vs 23% in the Census) and an under representation of those with less than a high school education (8% vs 14% in the Census). In all analyses, data were weighted to reflect the latest U.S. Census statistics with regard to children's age, gender, race, region of the country, and parent's education. This involved an assumption that the replies of non-surveyed members of under represented groups would be similar to those who were surveyed.

We will comment only briefly on the prevalence and chronicity statistics from the Gallup Survey because this is a methodological paper rather than a substantive report. But at least some consideration of these statistics is needed to evaluate the extent to which the CTSPC has been able to identify a meaningful pattern of parent behavior.

Definitions

(Insert Table 1 about here)

Prevalence. Table 1 provides data on two prevalence rates: annual and lifetime. The annual rate is the number per thousand parents who engaged in each CTSPC item during the previous year. The lifetime rate is the number per thousand who had ever engaged in each CTSPC item with the referent child. We use the rate per thousand because it permits easier comparison with the most widely used prevalence rates: cases reported to child protective services (National Center on Child Abuse & Neglect, 1996) and the National Incidence Survey (National Center on Child Abuse & Neglect, 1988).

Chronicity, as used here, applies to the subset of parents who engaged in at least one of the acts in the scale. It indicates how often those acts ocurred in the previous year. The chronicity measure is needed to deal with the extremely skewed distribution of the Physical Assault scale. This makes it inappropriate to use the mean to describe how often abusive acts ocurred. For example, Physical Assault item O in Table 1 shows a rate of 38 per thousand for hitting a child with an object on some part of the body other than the buttocks. This is a high rate. Nevertheless, it is also an extremely skewed distribution. As a result of the preponderance of non-violent parents, estimates of the average number of assaults are close to zero (0.2). A more meaningful estimate of the average number of assaults of this type in the previous 12 months (5.7 times) uses the mean based on just parents who experienced did it at least once.

Rates

Non-violent discipline. The top panel of Table 1 indicates, not surprisingly, that almost all parents (977 per thousand) reported engaging in at least one of the four disciplinary tactics in the Nonviolent Discipline scale. The chronicity mean of 46.0 indicates that parents reported using these four techniques an average of 46 times during the preceding 12 months. The most frequently used technique for correcting misbehavior was explaining why it was wrong.

The rates for Psychological Aggression show that it was almost as frequent as Nonviolent discipline. Again, not surprisingly, the most frequent mode of psychological aggression was shouting, yelling, or screaming at the child, and the next most frequent was threatening to spank or hit. Swearing and cursing the child ocurred much less often, but still at a very high rates (243 per thousand).

The Physical Assault scale covers a broad range of acts, from culturally legitimate corporal punishment to criminal acts of physical assault. The corporal punishment items in the scale account for most of the physical assaults by parents. A rate 614 per thousand was found for Corporal Punishment subscale (items H, P, D, R, and V. and C for children age 2 and over), as contrasted with a rate of 49 per thousand for the items making up the Severe Physical Assault (physical abuse) subscale (item C for children under 2, and items O, G, T, K, L, M and S). Although, as expected, the sevever physical assault ocurred at a much lower rate than the corporal punishment items, this rate is still about eleven times greater than the rate of 4 per thousand for cases reported to child protective services in 1994 (National Center On Child Abuse & Neglect, 1996: 2-5,), and five times greater than the rate of 9.1 per thousand uncovered by the Third National Incidence Study (Sedlak & Broadhurst, 1996).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Neglect scale revealed an annual prevalence rate of 270 per thousand. Almost all of this is attributable to leaving a child alone when the parent felt an adult should be present, and to not providing food the parent felt the child needed. However, item NE shows that there was also a fairly high rate of failure to provide adequate care because of problem drinking (23 per thousand).

RELIABILITY

A problem with the parent-child version of CTS1 that we had hoped to remedy with the CTSPC is low internal consistency reliability. The alpha coefficients from seven analyses of CTS1 data averaged .58 for the overall Physical Assault scale and .68 for the Psychological Aggression scale (Straus & Hamby, 1997). The CTSPC alpha coefficients for the present sample of parents are similar: Overall Physical Assault scale = .55, Psychological Aggression = .60, Nonviolent Discipline = 70, and the new Neglect scale has an alpha of only .22.

In the hope that a presumably more homogeneous subset of items would have a higher reliability, we computed alpha for the Corporal Punishment and Severe Physical Assault subscales of the overall Physical Assault scale. For Corporal Punishment, the alpha was almost identical to the alpha for the overall Physical Assault scale (.57). For the Severe Physical Assault subscale we found a near-zero coefficient (-.02). These results led us to review publications on the original CTS1 measure of physical maltreatment. Surprisingly, we found only data on reliability for the overall Physical Assault scale. None of the many papers presenting findings based on the CTS1 (including our own publications) reported the reliability of the Severe Assault (physical abuse) subscale. We therefore reanalyzed the CTS1 data in the 1985 National Family Violence Survey (Straus & Gelles, 1990a) and computed alpha for the Severe Assault scale (CTS1 items N, O, P, Q, R, and S). That also turned out to be near zero (.13). It seems that Severe Assault subscales of the CTS1 and the CTSPC share weaknesses as well strengths. Ordinarily, an instrument that lacks internal consistency can be expected to also be invalid. But, there is considerable evidence for the validity of the CTS1 physical abuse subscale (summarized in Straus & Hamby, 1997). Consequently, despite the lack of correlation among the items, it was decided to proceed with a preliminary examination of the validity of the CTSPC scales.

DISCRIMINANT AND CONSTRUCT VALIDITY

Evidence of construct validity occurs when a test is correlated with other variables for which there are theoretical or empirical grounds to expect an association (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). An overall judgement concerning construct validity takes many such linkages, including findings from different studies. An accumulated body of such evidence exists for the parent-to-child version of the CTS1 (see the review in Straus & Hamby, In Press 1997). But, even though the CTSPC retains the basic theoretical and operational approach of the CTS1, one cannot be sure that findings based on the CTS1 apply to the CTSPC. However, the prevalence rates in the previous section, and the findings on linkages with demographic variables and correlations between scales to be presented in this section are a start toward answering that question.

Demographic Correlates

Age of parent. There is evidence that older parents are less inclined to use corporal punishment and less likely to physically abuse a child than younger parents (Connelly & Straus, 1992). Therefore, if the CTSPC measures are valid, both corporal punishment and physical abuse should decrease with the age of the parent. We found a correlation of -.33 between parent's age and the Corporal Punishment Scale, and -.12 between parents age and the Physical Abuse scale. These correlations are consistent with previous research and theoretically meaningful, and therefore constitute a contribution to the evidence required to conclude that the CTSPC is a valid measure of violence by parents.

Age of child. The prevalence and the chronicity of corporal punishment declines rapidly from about age 5 on (Straus, 1994). However, for more severe violence by parents, i.e. physical abuse, the evidence is contradictory. Among cases known to child protective services, the physical abuse rate also decreases with age (National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, 1996), although not nearly as much as the decrease in corporal punishment. However, research using the CTS1 found no decrease in physical abuse with child's age (Wauchope & Straus, 1990). Wauchope and Straus argue that the higher rate of physical abuse of young children in CPS statistics reflects the greater risk of injury among infants and toddlers, rather than a greater rate of assault. Instruments such as the CTS1 and the CTSPC assess the occurrence of assaults, regardless of injury. We found a correlation of -.34 between child's age and corporal punishment and a non-significant correlation of -.06 with Physical Abuse.

Minority race/Ethnic group. Studies of Corporal Punishment have shown no clear difference between Anglo American and either African American or Hispanic American parents (Straus, 1994; Straus and Camacho, in press [1997]). On the other hand, research on physical abuse has typically found higher rates for the two minority groups. The higher rate of physical abuse may reflect the greater stress that minority group parents experience in American society. Whatever, the reason, if the CTSPC scales are valid, they should show, at most, a slight relation to minority status for corporal punishment, and a stronger relationship for physical abuse. Analyses of covariance (holding constant SES, age of child and parent, and gender of child and parent) found no significant difference between Euro Americans and African Americans in corporal punishment, For physical abuse, however, the African American rate of 148 per thousand was more than three times greater than the Euro-American rate of 34 per thousand ($F = 12.68$, $p < .001$).

Gender of parent. Previous research has found a slightly higher rate of corporal punishment and physical abuse by mothers than fathers. In relation to corporal punishment, Figure 1 shows a significant interaction between gender of parent and age of the child, after controlling for race and gender of the child and SES ($F = 2.84$, $p<.05$). The interaction is particularly important in the light of the most plausible explanation for the higher material rate --- that it reflects the far greater time spent in child care by mothers. Figure 1 is consistent with this explanation because it shows that the gender of parent difference is greatest for young children, i.e., at the ages when there is the greatest difference between mothers and fathers in child care. In respect to physical abuse, the rate for mothers (5.91) was more than double that for fathers (2.58), but the difference is not quite significant ($F = 2.15$, $p < .07$).

Correlations Among CTSPC Scales

The interrelations of the scales provide another opportunity to explore the construct and discriminant validity of the CTSPC. As with the demographic correlates, if scales are correlated when there are theoretical grounds for expecting a link between the constructs they purport to measure, those correlations contribute to evidence of construct validity; and if scales are not correlated when there is no basis for expecting a relationship, it can be regarded as evidence of "discriminant validity" (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). On the other hand, a correlation when there is no theoretical basis for expecting two constructs to be related, raises the possibility that the correlation results from a "method effect." Social desirability response set, for example, is a shared methodological element that could produce a correlation between the scales.

(Insert Table 2 about here)

Table 2 gives the correlations among the CTSPC scales, controlling for six variables that could produce spurious correlations such as the educational level of the parents. It is necessary to control for the education of the parents, for example, because high education parents might be more reluctant to disclose harsh disciplinary practices of all types. To avoid that possibility, parent's education and five other potential confounds (age of child, gender of child and of parent,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

child race, education of parent, and Southern Region) were controlled by computing the partial correlations among the CTSPC scales.

Correlates of nonviolent discipline. The first column of Table 2 shows the correlation of scores on the Nonviolent Discipline scale with each of the other scales. On theoretical grounds we hypothesized that nonviolent discipline (which includes techniques such as explaining and time out) would have a positive correlation with the Corporal Punishment scale because both are legal and hormative ways of controlling misbehavior. On the other hand, we expected a negative correlation between the Nonviolent Discipline scale and the Physical Abuse scale because, by definition, Physical Abuse is socially disapproved.

The correlation of .39 in the first column of Table 2 is consistent with the first hypothesis. The lower, but still positive correlation just below that of .23 with Severe Corporal Punishment is also consistent with our hypothesis because the Severe Corporal Punishment scale includes acts such as hitting a child with a paddle that are no longer considered legitimate by many, even though they are legal in every state of the U.S. The finding is consistent with our theoretical approach because severe corporal punishment is not as widely endorsed as a means of controlling misbehavior as is spanking and other mild forms of corporal punishment.

The second hypothesis, that there would be a negative correlation of Nonviolent Discipline with the Physical Abuse and Sexual Abuse scales was not supported because the correlations in rows 4 and 5 are near zero.

The relationships between Nonviolent Discipline and Psychological Aggression against a child was not the object of a hypothesis because of oversight. However, if we had posed a hypothesis, we would have posited a strong negative relationship. Instead, Rows 3A and 3B reveal positive correlations between Nonviolent Discipline with Psychological Aggression. An after-the- fact explanation is that the correlation is driven by the level of misbehavior of the child, i.e., that parents faced with misbehavior tend to use multiple strategies. In addition, it suggests that respondents tended to answer truthfully because, if the responses represented mainly a tendency to present themselves as engaging in socially desirable ways, there would be a tendency to report nonviolent discipline practices and to deny psychologically attacking a child, and this would result in a negative correlation rather than the observed positive correlation.

Correlates of corporal punishment. Column 2A of Table 2 shows the relation of the Ordinary Corporal Punishment subscale to the Psychological Aggression scale (rows 3A and B). The conflict-escalation theory of violence argues that verbal aggression, rather than being cathartic and tension reducing, tends to increase the risk of physical assault (Berkowitz, 1993). Empirical research has supported the escalation rather than the catharsis theory by finding a strong association between psychological aggression and the probability of physical assaults (Berkowitz, 1993; Murphy & O'Leary, 1989; Straus, 1974). If the escalation theory is correct, and if the CTSPC measures of Psychological Aggression and Physical Assault are valid, they should be highly correlated. The correlation of .56 is consistent with this theory and previous research and therefore supports the construct validity of the scale. However, the same theory predicts correlations that are at least as strong with Severe Psychological Aggression and Physical abuse, but the correlations are much lower (.24 and .13). One possible explanation is that the correlations are lower because of the extreme skewness of these two variables.

Correlates of physical abuse. If the scores were primarily a function of willingness to reveal unfavorable information, the abuse scales should be strongly correlated with measures of other types of maltreatment such as the Psychological Aggression Neglect scale, and with reporting that the child had experienced sexual abuse. In fact, the correlations are low (usually about .10). Substantively, this indicates that each type of maltreatment is relatively independent of the other.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DISCUSSION

The Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales (CTSPC) is a revision of the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) that is specifically focused on parental behavior. The modifications include:

* Revision of the Psychological Aggression and Physical Assault scales to (1) improve clarity and age-appropriateness; (2) add items to increase content validity; (3) better differentiate between levels of severity of aggression by parents.

* Replacement of the Reasoning scale by a Nonviolent Discipline scale.

* New supplementary scales to measure Neglect and Sexual Abuse, and supplemental questions on discipline methods used in the previous week.

Issues and Difficulties in the Measurement of Child Abuse

Numerous problems complicate measurement of child abuse. These problems suggest that measures of child abuse, especially those obtained from parents, may be particularly difficult to obtain, and pose more measurement problems than measures of partner abuse. In the sections below, we identify several issues and difficulties, explain how they were addressed, and evaluate how successfully by the CTSPC handles these difficulties.

Developmental issues. Children are likely to experience different forms of aggression than adults. Further, children of different ages are likely to experience somewhat different forms of aggression, and these forms may have differential impact at different ages. This is true of psychological and physical violence. For example, spanking infants is relatively infrequent, spanking toddlers is nearly universal, and slapping adolescents is common but not universal. Threatening to kick a child out of the house is probably most common during adolescence and may have little meaning for pre-verbal children. In terms of impact, shaking infants can be a serious and even life-threatening act, while shaking older children is unlikely to lead to serious injury.

The manifest content of the CTSPC is a considerable improvement over the CTS1 in terms of the appropriateness for parent-child interaction. The CTS1 retained all of the partner violence items in the parent-child scale, many of which are not especially suited to assessing parental behaviors. For example, psychological aggression items such as "stomped out of the room" and "said something to spite him/her," have less relevance to parent-child interactions than spouse-spouse interactions and have been omitted from the CTSPC. Physical assault items which are common between partners, such as "threw something at him/her," have been replaced by more common and important forms of child abuse such as shaking. Moreover, scoring the shaking item is age-dependent to reflect the severity of shaking infants. For other items, the complexity of age-based scoring was avoided by wording items as broadly applicable as possible. In the present sample, internal consistency varied only slightly across age groups, suggesting that these problems have been adequately addressed in the revision.

Normative issues and social desirability. Some forms of aggression towards children, such as spanking and shouting, are normative both legally and culturally. With the increased recognition of the problem of child abuse, more severe forms of aggression such as hitting a child with a belt or paddle, although still legal (see for example NH vs Johnson. No. 90-533, New Hampshire Supreme Court, June 25, 1992) are less acceptable than 20 years ago, when the first self-report studies of child abuse were done (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). Thus, the effects of a socially desirable response set must be considered in the assessment of child abuse.

Unfortunately, a standardized measure of social desirability was not available in the Gallup survey. This precluded one important way of investigating this phenomena. However, the CTSPC addresses the issue of social desirability in several ways. First, the CTSPC includes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

several nonviolent discipline items that provide respondents an opportunity to show that they have carried out socially appropriate responses to the child's misbehavior, creating a "context of legitimation" (Shehan, 1995, p. 2). The CTSPC begins with two of these socially acceptable discipline items to help create this context. The remaining items are presented in an interspersed order to avoid providing information about the researchers' perceptions of item severity. Dahlstrom, Brooks, and Peterson (1990) found that this strategy increased endorsement of items in their study of depression. Additionally, care has been taken to use words such as "spanked" instead of "hit," because spanking is the socially acceptable way of describing hitting a child on the buttocks with the hand. Also, some items have been made more specific to help identify the normative status of the act. For example, because hitting a child on the buttocks with an object is more socially acceptable than on other parts of the body, the item "Hit with a belt, a hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object" was replaced by two items, one of which begins "Hit on the bottom with...."and the other begins with"Hit on some other part of the body besides the bottom with..."

The results reported in this paper suggest that these efforts to address social desirability response biases met with mixed success. On the positive side, as noted earlier, pretesting indicated that respondents preferred the interspersed order to the hierarchical order. The overall yearly incidence rate for severe assaults reported in the Findings section is several times greater, than the rate of cases known to child protective services or the National Incidence surveys, and the sexual abuse rate (Finkelhor et al, 1997) is nine times greater than the rate of officially known cases (National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, 1996). These findings based on the CTSPC are consistent with the findings from studies which used the CTS1 to estimate rates of physical abuse (summarized in Straus & Gelles, 1990b, Table 6-3, part B).

Reliability. Perhaps the most problematic finding is the low intercorrelation among the items, and especially the severe physical assault items used to measure physical abuse of children. This indicates, for example, that a parent who reported kicking a child is no more likely than any other parent to have reported punching the child. Conceptually, a single report of any of these severe assault items may meet a threshold criterion for child abuse, but statistically their lack of correlation presents problems for using the child abuse items as a subscale. Consequently, rather than using the items as an additive scale, these items may be most useful for a binary determination of whether the respondent has engaged in one or more acts of maltreatment. This is what is accomplished by the Severe Assault prevalence measure (which assigns a score of 1 if one or more of the items occurred, and a score of zero if none of them occurred). This is the way most research on child maltreatment has used the CTS. This research provides evidence that the CTSPC is likely to be a useful instrument for epidemiological research on child maltreatment and for clinical screening. One type of evidence is the much higher rates of child maltreatment from the use of this instrument than from other sources. Another type of evidence comes from the construct validity analyses. These analyses show that scores on the CTSPC are associated with other variables in ways that are theoretically appropriate and consistent with previous empirical findings. For example, because mothers do far more child care than fathers, they can be expected to have a higher rate of child maltreatment, and this expectation is borne out by many studies, as well as in the present study using the CTSPC. It is remarkable that, despite low internal consistency reliability, the CTS1 has been used successfully in a great deal of research on physical abuse. The preliminary evidence presented in this paper for the CTSPC suggests that it could be similarly useful despite the similarly low reliability.

Possible Uses of the CTSPC

In the light of the evidence suggesting that social desirability reduces reporting of physical and psychological attacks, the information provided by the CTSPC must be considered a minimum estimate of child abuse. If the "lower bound" nature of the data is kept in mind, we believe that the CTSPC can be useful in research and clinical settings.

Epidemiological research on prevalence, risk factors, and sequelae. Despite the presumed under-reporting, the CTSPC results in rates that are several times higher than rates based on cases known to professionals. Consequently the CTSPC may be useful to provide prevalence estimates for cities, regions, or nations, or for specific types of populations, such as low income and young parents. Thus, the CTSPC, like the CTS1, will permit research that cannot usually be conducted with a purely clinical sample because a non-abuser sample is rarely available for comparison (see Kinard, 1994, 1995 for an exception). The CTSPC can be similarly useful in research on the sequelae of maltreatment in the general population.

Clinical screening. In clinical settings, experience with maritally distressed couples shows that the CTS1 reveals physical violence between partners that, in about three quarters of the cases, was not known to the therapist (Aldarondo & Straus, 1994; O'Leary & Murphy, 1992). The CTS1 also found more violence among men arrested for wife-assault than was known to police or prosecutors (Ford, 1990). The CTSPC may also be useful in screening for child abuse.

Evaluation of treatment and prevention programs. The CTS1 has been used in more than 20 studies evaluating progress in treatment of wife-assault (e.g.,Dunford, 1990; Edelson & Syers, 1990, 1991; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986) and in a few studies evaluating child abuse treatment or prevention programs such as home visiting (Olds & Kitzman, 1993). Since, as noted earlier, the theoretical basis and mode of operationalization of the CTSPC is basically the same as the CTS1, the successful use of the CTS1 suggests that the CTSPC could also be an important tool for evaluating prevention and treatment of physical and psychological abuse of children.

APPENDIX 1. ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING

Applicable Populations

Educational and Ethnic group. Although the CTSPC was designed to facilitate self-administration, it can be administered as a face-to-face or telephone interview. In revising the CTS we kept the vocabulary and sentence structure simple to make it applicable to a broad section of the population. The Flesch grade level measure (Flesch, 1949) for the three basic scales (Nonviolent Discipline, Psychological Aggression, and Physical Assault) is 6th grade. If the supplemental scales (Neglect and Sexual Abuse) are included, it is slightly higher (6.4). In addition, the CTSPC is likely to be usable with many cultural groups because CTS1 has been used with several U.S. ethnic groups and in other nations and the CTSPC retains the basic conceptualization and operationalization used for the CTS1.

Child respondents. The original CTS has been used with child respondents (Kolko, Kazdin, & Day, 1996). The CTSPC can also be used with children as the respondents. For pre-adolescents, this needs to be done in the format of an interview. The self-administered questionnaire format can be used with adolescents. With adult children it can be used to obtain recall data on the behavior of their parents when they lived at home. When a child is the respondent, each item can be asked about the mother and the father.

Self Only and Self and Partner Mode of Administration

The CTS has usually been administered by asking parents to describe what they themselves have done ("Self Only" instructions). In two-parent households this omits actions of the other parent. Ideally both parents should complete the CTS, but this is often not possible. One alternative is to present the questions in pairs, one for the respondent's self-report and the

other for the respondent to indicate the partner's behavior. However, this doubles the administration time, and also depends on the respondent being able to estimate how often the partner engaged in each of the behaviors in the CTSPC.

We conducted an experiment on a variation which could at least avoid most of the increased testing time. A random half of respondents received the "Self Only" instructions and the other half were asked to indicate what they and their partner have done ("Self and Partner" instructions). This experiment was limited to two-parent households and to the items in the Nonviolent Discipline, Psychological Aggression, Physical Assault, and Neglect scales. It should be noted that one would not expect the rates to double when there is data on both parents because parental behavior will be correlated but not mirror images of each other and because one parent will not know everything that the other has done. Nonetheless, we expected the rates to be higher when respondents are asked about the behavior of both parents. Contrary to the hypothesized increase in rates, there was a significant difference between the two groups only on the Neglect scale, and even that difference was not in the predicted direction: Respondents who described only their own behavior reported higher levels of neglect than those describing their own and their partner's behavior. We do not have an explanation for these findings and we plan a second experiment to examine the findings when the items are presented in pairs, one for respondent self-report and one for the respondent's report concerning the partner. In the meantime, we recommend the "self-only" mode of administration.

Other uses. The CTS1 items have also been used as coding categories for analysis of documents data such as police records (Claes & Rosenthal, 1990), orders of protection (Gondolf , Mcwilliams, Hart, & Stuehling 1994), and psychiatric intake interviews (Gondolf, Mulvey, & Lidz, 1990), and the CTSPC might also be useful for this purpose.

Length and Testing Time

The three core CTSPC scales are slightly longer than the CTS1 (22 compared to 19 items). If the 14 supplimental questions are added, it is almost double the length. Despite that, the administration time (10-15 minutes) is still brief enough to be practical in clinical settings or for inclusion in epidemiological surveys. If greater brevity is need, the supplemental questions can be omitted, which makes the testing time about 6 to 8 minutes.

Referent Time Period and Referent Situation

Referent time period. The standard instructions for the CTS ask what happened in the previous year. However, this can be modified to ask about other referent periods, e.g., since moving in with a new partner, since a previous stage of a treatment program, or the previous month or six months.

Referent event or situation. An alternate to a time period referent is a specific conflict or situation. It may be easier to recall what happened in relation to a specific conflict or situation than a time period. If so, it could produce more accurate information, but at the cost of losing information about other situations and therefore annual prevalence rates for violence. In clinical applications, however, period-prevalence rates are not usually of interest. A specific conflict referent might provide information that could be discussed with the client to help develop appropriate modes of dealing with those situations. There are also some situations where the CTS can be administered with both types of referent. The referent for the initial testing might be for a time period such as the previous 12 months. When a particularly difficult situation or type of conflict has been identified in the course of working with the family, a subsequent testing might use the next occurrence of that situation as the referent.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Permission for Research Use of the CTSPC

Permission to reproduce the CTSPC will be granted without charge to persons who agree to carry out and report psychometric analyses (such as reliability and factor analyses), or who agree to provide us with data to use for psychometric analysis. If data are provided, their use will be limited to psychometric analyses, and the right to use the data for substantive analyses will rest exclusively with the person or persons providing the data.

Scoring

Scoring the CTSPC follows the principles described and explained in the manual for the CTS1 (Straus, 1995) and in Straus and Gelles (1990b). Consequently, this section covers only the most basic aspects of scoring.

The CTS is scored by adding the midpoints for the response categories chosen by the participant. The midpoints are the same as the response category numbers for categories 0, 1, and 2. For category 3 (3-5 times) the midpoint is 4, for category 4 (6-10 times) it is 8, for category 5 (11-20 times) it is 15, and for category 6 (More than 20 times in the past year) we suggest using 25 as the midpoint.

Treatment of response category 7. Response category 7 ("Not in the past year, but it did happen before that") is used in two ways. (1) When scores for the previous year are desired (the usual use of the CTS), category 7 is scored as zero. (2) Category 7 can also be used to obtain a "relationship-prevalence" measure of physical assault, i.e. did an assault ever occur? Respondents who answer 1 through 7 are scored as 1 (yes).

Prevalence and chronicity. As explained earlier, when the CTS is used for research with any type of sample except cases known to be violent (such as parents in a treatment program), we recommend creating two variables for each Physical Assault scale & subscale: a prevalence variable and a chronicity variable. The prevalence variable is a 0-1 dichotomy, with a score of 1 assigned if one or more of the acts in the scale occurred. The chronicity variable is the number of times the acts in the scale occurred, among those who engaged in at least one of the acts in the scale. Uses of the CTS with a person or group known to be violent does not require separate prevalence and chronicity variables because prevalence is already known.

Alternative Response Categories

Users of the CTS1 have sometimes replaced the 0 to 20+ response categories with categories such as never, sometimes, often, and frequently. The 0 to 20+ categories are preferable because of person-to-person and situation-to-situation differences in the numerical referent of words such as sometimes, often, and frequently; and because numerical categories permit estimates of the number of physical assaults and injuries.

APPENDIX 2. PARENT-CHILD CONFLICT TACTICS SCALES, FORM A

Copywrite © 1995 by Murray A. Straus, Sherry L. Hamby,
David Finkelhor, and Desmond Runyan
Note: The CTSPC is copyrighted. Please write for permission to use.

ITEMS IN INTERSPERSED ORDER

Children often do things that are wrong, disobey, or make their parents angry. We would like to know what you have done when your [SAY age of referent child] year old child, did something wrong or made you upset or angry.

I am going to read a list of things you might have done in the past year and I would like you to tell me whether you have: done it once in the past year, done it twice in the past year, 3-5 times, 6-10 times, 11-20 times, or more than 20 times in the past year. If you haven't done it in the past year but have done it before that, I would like to know this, too.

1 = Once in the past year
2 = Twice in the past year
3 = 3-5 times in the past year
4 = 6-10 times in the past year
5 = 11-20 times in the past year
6 = More than 20 times in the past year
7 = Not in the past year, but it happened before
0 = This has never happened

A. Explained why something was wrong
B. Put him/her in "time out" (or sent to his/her room)
C. Shook him/her
D. Hit him/her on the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object
E. Gave him/her something else to do instead of what he/she was doing wrong
F. Shouted, yelled, or screamed at him/her
G. Hit him/her with a fist or kicked him/her hard
H. Spanked him/her on the bottom with your bare hand
I. Grabbed him/her around the neck and choked him/her
J. Swore or cursed at him/her
K. Beat him/her up, that is you hit him/her over and over as hard as you could
L. Said you would send him/her away or kick him/her out of the house
M. Burned or scalded him/her on purpose
N. Threatened to spank or hit him/her but did not actually do it
O. Hit him/her on some other part of the body besides the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object
P. Slapped him/her on the hand, arm, or leg
Q. Took away privileges or grounded him/her
R. Pinched him/her
S. Threatened him/her with a knife or gun
T. Threw or knocked him/her down
U. Called him/her dumb or lazy or some other name like that
V. Slapped him/her on the face or head or ears

CTS1 AND CTSPC ITEMS ARRANGED BY SCALE AND SUBSCALE

CTS1

Reasoning

A. Discussed an issue calmly with (child name)
B. Got information to back up your side of things
C. Brought in, or tried to bring in someone to help settle things

Psychological Aggression

D. Insulted or swore at him/her
E. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue
F. Stomped out of the room or house or yard
G. Cried (this item is not scored)
H. Did or said something to spite him/her
I. Threatened to hit or throw something at him/her
J. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something

Physical Assault

Minor Assault (Corporal Punishment)
K. Threw something at him/her
L. Pushed, Grabbed, or shoved him/her
M. Slapped or Spanked him/her

Severe Assault (Physical Abuse)
N. Kicked, bit, or hit him/her with a fist
O. Hit or tried to hit him/her with something.
P. Beat him/her up
Q. Burned or scalded him/her.
R. Threatened him/her with a knife or gun.
S. Used a knife or fired a gun

CTSPC

Non-violent Discipline

A. Explained why something was wrong
B. Put him/her in "time out" (or sent to his/her room)
Q. Took away privileges or grounded him/her
E. Gave him/her something else to do instead of what he/she was doing wrong

Psychological Aggression

N. Threatened to spank or hit him/her but did not actually do it
F. Shouted, yelled, or screamed at him/her
J. Swore or cursed at him/her
U. Called him/her dumb or lazy or some other name like that
L. Said you would send him/her away or kick him/her out of the house

Physical Assault

Minor Assault (Corporal Punishment)
H. Spanked him/her on the bottom with your bare hand
D. Hit him/her on the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object
P. Slapped him/her on the hand, arm, or leg
R. Pinched him/her
C. Shook him/her (this is scored for Very Severe If the child is <2 years)

Severe Assault (Physical Abuse)
V. Slapped him/her on the face or head or ears
O. Hit him/her on some other part of the body besides the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object
T. Threw or knocked him/her down
G. Hit him/her with a fist or kicked him/her hard

Very Severe Assault (Severe Physical Abuse)
K. Beat him/her up, that is you hit him/her over and over as hard as youcould
I. Grabbed him/her around the neck and choked him/her
M. Burned or scalded him/her on purpose
S. Threatened him/her with a knife or gun

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

Weekly Discipline (Recommended when corporal punishment is a focus)

Sometimes it's hard to remember what happened over an entire year, so we'd like to ask a few of these questions again, just about the last week. For each of these questions, tell me how many times they happened in the last week.

1 = Once in the last week
2 = Twice in the last week
3 = 3-5 times in the last week
4 = 6-10 times in the last week
5 = 11-20 times in the last week
6 = More than 20 times in the last week
0 = This has not happened in the last week

WA. Put him/her in "time out" (or sent to his/her room)
WB. Shouted, yelled, or screamed at him/her
WC. Spanked him/her on the bottom with your bare hand
WD. Slapped him/her on the hand, arm, or leg

Neglect

Sometimes things can get in the way of caring for your child the way you would like to: for example, money problems, personal problems, or having a lot to do. Please tell me how many times in the last year this has happened to you in trying to care for your child. Please tell me how many times you:

1 = Once in the past year
2 = Twice in the past year
3 = 3-5 times in the past year
4 = 6-10 times in the past year
5 = 11-20 times in the past year
6 = More than 20 times in the past year
7 = Not in the past year, but it happened before
0 = This has never happened

NA. Had to leave your child home alone, even when you thought some adult should be with him/her
NB. Were so caught up with your own problems that you were not able to show or tell your child that you loved him/her
NC. Were not able to make sure your child got the food he/she needed
ND. Were not able to make sure your child got to a doctor or hospital when he/she needed it
NE. Were so drunk or high that you had a problem taking of your child

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sexual Abuse

The questions on sexual abuse (questions SC and SD) are preceded by questions on sexual abuse of experienced by the parent (questions SA and SB). This was done on the assumption that is it is somewhat less threatening to be asked about or reveal one's own victimization than it is to be questioned about sexual abuse of one's children. See Finkelhor et al, 1996 for further information on the sexual abuse supplemental questions.

Now I would like to ask you something about your own experiences as a child that may be very sensitive. As you know, sometimes, in spite of efforts to protect them, children get sexually abused, molested, or touched in sexual ways that are wrong. To find out more about how often they occur, we would like to ask you about your own experiences when you were a child.

SA. Before the age of 18, were you personally ever touched in a sexual way by an adult or older child, when you did not want to be touched that way, or were you ever forced to touch an adult or older child in a sexual way -- including anyone who was a member of your family, or anyone outside your family? (If "Yes", ask:) did it happen more than once?

1 Yes, it happened more than once
2 Yes, it happened just once
3 No, it did not happen

SB. Before the age of 18, were you ever forced to have sex by an adult or older child -- including anyone who was a member of your family, or anyone outside your family? (If "Yes", ask:) Did it happen more than once?

1 Yes, it happened more than once
2 Yes, it happened just once
3 No, it did not happen

SC. What about the experience of your own child. As far as you know, IN THE PAST YEAR, has your child been touched in a sexual way by an adult or older child when your child did not want to be touched that way, or has (he/she) been forced to touch an adult or an older child in a sexual way -- including anyone who was a member of your family, or anyone outside your family? (If "Yes", ask:) Has it happened more than once? (If "No", ask:) Has it ever happened?

1 Yes, it happened more than once
2 Yes, it happened just once
3 No, has not happened in the past year, but has happened
4 No, it has never happened

SD. In the last year, has your child been forced to have sex by an adult or an older child -- including anyone who was a member of your family, or anyone outside your family? (If "Yes", ask:) Has it happened more than once? (If "No", ask:) Has it ever happened?

1 Yes, it happened more than once
2 Yes, it happened just once
3 No, has not happened in the past year, but has happened
4 No, it has never happened

REFERENCES

Adams, B. N. (1965). Coercion and consensus theories: Some unresolved issues. American Journal of Sociology, 71, 714-716.

Aldarondo, E., & Straus, M. A. (1994). Screening for physical violence in couple therapy: Methodological, practical, and ethical considerations. Family Process, 33, 425-439.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 81-105.

Claes, J. A. & Rosenthal, D. M. (1990). Men who batter women: A study in power. Journal of Family Violence, 5(3), 215-224.

Connelly, C. D. & Straus, M. A. (1992). Mother's age and risk for physical abuse. Child Abuse and Neglect, 16,709-718.

Coser, L. (1956). The functions of social conflict. New York: Free Press.

Dahlstrom, W. G., Brooks, J. D., & Peterson, C. D. (1990). The beck depression inventory: Item order and the impact of response sets. Journal of Personality Assessment, 55, 224-233.

Dahrendorf, R. (1959). Class and class conflict in industrial society. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Dunford, F. W. (1990). System-initiated warrants for suspects of misdemeanor domestic assault: A pilot study. Justice Quarterly, 7,631-653.

Eblen, C. N. (1987). The Influence of Stress and Social Support upon Child Abuse. Arizona State University. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation.

Edleson, J. L. & Syers, M. (1990). Relative effectiveness of group treatments for men who batter. Social Work Research and Abstracts, 26,10-17.

Edleson, J. L. & Syers, M. (1991). The effects of group treatment for men who batter: An 18-month follow-up study. Research on Social Work Practice, 1, 227-243.

Finkelhor, D., Moore, D., Hamby, S.L., & Straus, M.A. (In press, 1997). "Sexual abused children in a national survey of parents: Methodological Issues." Child Abuse and Neglect, 21, 1-9.

Flesch, R. (1949). The art of readable writing. NY: Harper.

Ford, D. A. 1990. Validity of using the Conflict Tactics Scales in the Indianapolis prosecution experiment. In M. A. Straus, Manual For the Conflict Tactics Scales, Durham NH: Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire.

Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1988). Intimate violence. NY: Simon and Schuster.

Giles-Sims, J., Straus, M. A., & Sugarman, D. B. (1995) Child, maternal and family characteristics associated with spanking Family Relations, 44(2), 170-176.

Gondolf, E. W., Mcwilliams, J., Hart, B., & Stuehling, J. (1994). Court responses to petitions for civil protection orders. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9(4), 503-517.

Gondolf, E. W., Mulvey, E. P., & Lidz, C. W. (1990). Characteristics of perpetrators of family and nonfamily assaults. Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 42(2), 191-193.

Hamberger, K. L. & Hastings, J. E. (1986). Characteristics of male spouse abusers: Is psychopathology part of the picture? Batter and Victim Characteristics: Implications and Interventions. Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Atlanta, Georgia.

Kinard, E. M. (1994). Methodological issues and practical problems in conducting research on maltreated children. Child Abuse & Neglect, 18(8): 645-656.

Kinard, E. M. (1995). Perceived social support and competence in abused children: A longitudinal perspective. Journal of Family Violence, 10(1): 73-98.

Kolko, D. J, Kazdin, A. E., and Day, B. T. (1996). Children's perspectives in the assessment of family violence: Psychometric characteristics and comparison to parent reports. Child maltreatment, 1, 156-167.

Murphy, C.& O'Leary, K. D.. (1989). Psychological aggression predicts physical aggression in early marriage. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57, 579-582.

National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect. (1988). Study Findings: Study of National Incidence and Prevalence of Child Abuse and Neglect: 1988. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect. (1996), Child Maltreatment 1994: Reports from the States to the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Nelson, E. C., & Berwick, D. M. (1989). The measurement of health status in clinical practice. Medical Care, 27, 77.

Olds, D. & Kitzman, H. (1993). Review of research on home visiting for pregnant women and parents of young children. The Future of Children 3,(3): 53-92.

O'Leary, K. D., & Murphy, C. (1992). Clinical issues in the assessment of spouse abuse. In R.T. Ammerman & M. Hersen (Eds.), Assessment of family violence (pp. 26-46). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Scanzoni, J. (1972). Marital conflict as a positive force. In Scanzoni, J (Ed.) Sexual bargaining Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Sedlak, A.J. & Broadhurst, D.D. (1996) Third National incidence study of child abuse and neglect. National Center on Child Abues and Neglect, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Shehan, C. L. (1995, November) Discussion: Comment on Straus et al. (1995). Paper presented at the Theory and Methodology Workshop, National Council on Family Relations, annual meeting, Portland, Oregon.

Simmel, G. (1955). Conflict and the web of group affiliations. Glencoe,IL: The Free Press.

Sprey J. (1979). Conflict theory and the Study of Marriage and the Family. In W.R. Burr., R. Hill., R.I. Nye., & I.L. Reiss (Eds.) Contemporary theories about the family (pp. 130-159). New York: The Free Press.

Straus, M. A. . (1974). Leveling, civility, and violence in the family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36,13-29. Plus addendum in August 1974 issue.

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics Scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 75-88.

Straus, M. A. (1990a). The Conflict Tactics Scale and its critics: An evaluation and new data on validity and reliability. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles, Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families (pp. 49-73). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Straus, M. A. (1990b). Injury and frequency of assault and the 'Representative Sample Fallacy' in measuring wife beating and child abuse. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles, Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families (pp. 75-91). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Straus, M. A. (1994). Beating The Devil Out Of Them: Corporal Punishment In American Families. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Straus, M. A. (1995). Manual For the Conflict Tactics Scales. Durham, NH: Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire.

Straus, M. A. & Camacho, T. (In press, 1997). Corporal punishment by Hispanic families. Journal of Comparative Family Studies.

Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1990a). Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1990b). How violent are American families? Estimates from the national family violence resurvey and other studies. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles, Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families (pp. 95-112). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Straus, M. A., & Hamby, S. L. (1997). Measuring physical and psychological maltreatment of children with the Conflict Tactics Scales. In Kaufman Kantor, G. & Jasinski, J. L.. (Eds.) Out of the darkness: contemporary research perspectives on family violence. Sage publications.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family. New York: Double day /Anchor.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S. & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. Journal of Family Issues, 17 (3)283-316.

Straus, M. A., Kaufman Kantor, G. (1987). Stress and physical child abuse. Child Abuse and Neglect, 4 , 75-88. Also in R. E. Helfer & C. H. Kempe (Eds.) The Battered Child, 4th Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Straus, M. A., & Mathur, A. K. (1996). Social change and trends in approval of corporal punishment by parents from 1968 to 1994. In D. Frehsee, W. Horn, K. D. Bussman (Eds.) Family Violence Against Children Berlin & NY: Walter de Gruyter. (pp. 91-106).

Vissing, Y. M., Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Harrop, J. W. (1991). Verbal aggression by parents and psychosocial problems of children. Child Abuse & Neglect, 15, 223-238.

Wauchope, B. A. & Straus, M. A. (1990). Physical punishment and physical abuse of American children: Incidence rates by age, gender and occupational class. (Pp. 133-148) In Straus, M. A & Gelles, R. J. (Eds.) Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

TABLES

Table 1. Prevalence Rates per Thousand and Chronicity Estimates for CTSPC Scales and Items *

Scale and Items	Prevalence Year	Prevalence Ever	Year Chronicity**
Nonviolent Discipline	**977**	**999**	**48.0**
A. Explained why something was wrong	943	945	18.3
E. Gave him/her something else to do instead of what he/she was doing	770	831	12.2
Q. Took away privileges or grounded him/her	760	785	10.8
B. Put in "time out" (or sent to room)	755	813	13.0
Psychological Aggression	**856**	**899**	**21.7**
F. Shouted, yelled, or screamed at	847	867	12.8
N. Threatened to spank or hit but did not actually do it	536	618	10.6
J. Swore or cursed at	243	260	6.5
U. Called him/her dumb or lazy or some other name like that	163	175	5.7
L. Said you would send him/her away or kicked him/her out of the house	60	7	3.9
Physical Assault	**615**	**770**	**13.4**
H. Spanked on bottom with bare hand	469	636	7.5
P. Slapped on the hand, arm, or leg	369	512	7.3
D. Hit on the bottom with a belt, a hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object	207	294	5.5
C. Shook him/her: All children	90	150	2.8
" " Child under age 2	43	43	2.4
" " Child age 2 and older	96	161	3.9
O. Hit some other part of the body besides the bottom with a belt, a hairbrush, a stick	38	50	5.7
R. Pinched him/her	43	59	6.4
V. Slapped on the face, head or ears	46	64	3.4
G. Hit with a fist or kicked hard	3	14	3.7
T. Threw or knocked down	2	8	4.2
K. Beat up, that is you hit him/her over and over as hard as you could.	2	6	1.8
I. Grabbed around neck and chocked	-	7	-
M. Burned or scolded on purpose	-	1	-
S. Threatened with a knife or gun	-	1	-
Neglect	**270**	**306**	**6.9**
NA. Had to leave your child home alone, even when you thought some adult should be with him/her	195	213	6.0
NC. Were not able to make sure your child got the food he/she needed	110	137	5.5
NE. Were so drunk or high that you had a problem taking care of your child	23	33	5.9
ND. Were not able to make sure your child got to a doctor or hospital when he/she needed it	4	12	2.0
NB. Were so caught up with problems that you were not able to show or tell your child that you loved him/her	2	11	4.6

* The items are arranged in order of frequency of occurrence. The letters preceding each item are letter identification in the CTSPC as printed in the Appendix. There is no prevalence or chronicity for the last three Physical Assault items because no instances were reported for the current year.

** Chronicity is the mean number of times each act was reported among the subset of parents who reported at least one occurrence.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2. Partial Correlations Between CTSPC Scales *

Scale	1	2A	2B	3A	4	5
1. Nonviolent Discipline	--					
2. Minor Assault (Corporal Punishment)						
A. Ordinary	.39	--	--			
B. Severe	.23	.34	--			
3. Psychological Aggression						
A. Ordinary	.53	.56	.33	--		
B. Severe	.22	.24	.23	--		
4. Physical Abuse	.04	.13	.24	.14		
5. Sexual Abuse	.03	.00	.01	.02	.01	--

* All variables are the annual frequency version of the scale or subscale (see text). The variables controlled by partial correlation are age of child, gender of child and parent, education of parent, and residence in the South.. Correlations of .05 or greater are significant at $p<.05$.